

REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-20. By this paper, Applicants have corrected minor typographical errors in the specification and in claims 16 and 20, and Applicants have amended claims 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 9, 10, 12, 14, and 17 to clarify certain features. New claims 21- 25 have also been added. These amendments do not add any new matter. Upon entry of these amendments, claims 1-25 remain pending in the present application and are believed to be in condition for allowance. In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims.

New Claims

Applicants respectfully request that new claims 21-25 be considered. The claims are fully supported by the specification. Applicants respectfully submit that none of the cited references disclose the subject matter recited in claims 21-25.

Objection to the Drawings

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to Fig. 2 as failing to comply with 37 C.F.R. § 1.84(p)(5), because Fig. 2 included reference numbers 502 and 504 that were not mentioned in the description. Although Applicants do not believe that it is necessary to provide additional description of elements 502 and 504, Applicants have amended page 24 of the specification to describe the elements referred to by the reference numbers 502 and 504 in the interest of expediting the examination of the present application. This amendment does not add any new matter to the present application, and Applicants

respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the objection to the drawings in view of this amendment.

Objections to the Specification

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the disclosure because of the following informalities:

- (a) Page 27 lines 6 and 8 refer to a “TRST#” signal instead of “TRST”;
 - (b) Page 31 line 11, and page 33 lines 3, 7 and 14 recite “JTAG master 406” instead of “JTAG master 404”; and
 - (c) Page 31, line 9 recites “function” instead of “functions.”
- Office Action, page 2, line 19 – page 3, line 3

As these errors were minor typographical errors, Applicants have amended the specification to correct them, as set forth above. Specifically, pages 24 and 27 have been amended to clarify the description of the TRST signal, pages 25, 33, and 39 have been amended to correct misnumbering or mislabeling of the JTAG Master 404, and page 33 has been amended to replace “function” with “functions.” Applicants note that “function” is used instead of “functions” on page 33, and not on page 31 as stated by the Examiner. As such, the correction was made to page 33. In view of these amendments, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the objection to the specification.

Claim Objections

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to claims 1, 6, 7, 9, 12, and 14 asserting that “the phrase ‘adapted to’ is not a positive limitation of the scope of the claims.” Page 3, lines 7-8.

Even though Applicants believe that “adapted to” is a positive limitation of the claims, Applicants have chosen to amend the affected claims to recite “configured to” instead of “adapted to” in order to expedite the examination of the present application. See *R.A.C.C. Industries Inc. v. Stun-Tech Inc.*, 49 U.S.P.Q.2d 1793, 1796-97 (Fed. Cir. 1998) (unpublished). It should be noted, however, that this amendment does not affect the scope of the amended claims. For this reason, Applicants request that the Examiner withdraw his objection to claims 1, 6, 7, 9, 12, and 14.

The Examiner also objected to claim 16. Specifically, the Examiner stated that “where a claim sets forth steps of a method, each step should be separated by an indentation (see MPEP 608.01(a), paragraph 6.02i).” Page 3, lines 9-11. In response to this objection, Applicants have amended claim 16 to provide separate indentations for each act. The Examiner also objected to claim 20 because the word “performed” is misspelled. Page 3, lines 12-13. Claim 20 has been amended to correct this minor error.

Lastly, the Examiner objected to claim 20 under 37 C.F.R. § 1.75(c), as “being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim.” Page 3, lines 14-15. Applicants respectfully traverse this objection.

Claim 20 recites “[t]he method of claim 16 wherein the recited acts are performed in the recited order.” Contrary to the Examiner suggestion, performing the acts recited in claim 16 in the recited order is a further limitation on the subject matter of claim 16. As the Federal Circuit recently noted that “[u]nless the steps of a method actually recite an order, the steps are not ordinarily construed to require one.” *Altiris Inc. v. Symantec Corp.*, 65 U.S.P.Q.2d 1865, 1869 (Fed. Cir. 2003) *quoting Interactive Gift Express, Inc. v. Compuserve Inc.*, 59 U.S.P.Q.2d 1401, 1416 (Fed. Cir. 2000). As such, because claim 16 does not require that its recited acts be performed in any particular order, it is clearly a further limitation to require that the recited acts be performed in the recited order, as stated in claim 20. For this reason, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the objection to claim 20.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Examiner rejected claims 2, 3, 7, 10, 14, and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Applicants have amended these claims and respectfully submit that the amended claims fully comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112.

Specifically with regard to claims 2, 3, and 10, the Examiner asserted that “ICE and ITP are more like protocols [than interfaces].” Page 4, line 5. However, as stated in the present application:

Intel Corporation, a major manufacturer of microprocessors and chipsets, has adopted the JTAG architecture as part of its In-Target Probe ("ITP") and In-Circuit Emulation ("ICE") test methodologies. ITP and ICE employ standard JTAG signals, plus a few others. The ITP and ICE methodologies are widely used to troubleshoot and configure microprocessors, chipsets and other chips. Page 6, lines 6-10.

As such, Applicants believes that it is proper to characterize ITP and ICE as interface types. In the interests of clarification, however, Applicants have amended claims 2, 3, and 10 to set forth that the ITP or ICE interfaces comprise an interface that uses either the ITP or the ICE test methodology, as appropriate. These amendments do not alter the scope of the original claims. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the Examiner's rejection of claims 2, 3, and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Next, in regard to claims 7, 14, and 17, the Examiner stated that:

These claims refer to an action to be taken "when the server is powered up". [sic] The claims are unclear as to this intent; is the action to be taken during initial powering-on of the server, or is the action taken when there is power applied to the server (in other words, not shut down)? These two choices are not the same, but the applicant's claim language may imply either. Page 4, lines 12-14.

Although Applicants do not agree that the claims are ambiguous, as asserted by the Examiner, in the interest of clarifying claims 7, 14, and 17, Applicants have amended these claims to read "when the management server is initially powered up" instead of "when the management server is powered up." These amendments do not alter the scope

of the original claims. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the Examiner's rejection of claims 7, 14, and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

In the Official Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 4-9, and 11-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable by Li et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6, 598, 193, hereafter referred to as Li) in view of Falik et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,606,078 hereafter referred to as Falik). Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejections.

Legal Precedent

First, the burden of establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness falls on the Examiner. *Ex parte Wolters and Kuypers*, 214 U.S.P.Q. 735 (PTO Bd. App. 1979). Obviousness cannot be established by combining the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention absent some teaching or suggestion supporting the combination. *ACS Hospital Systems, Inc. v. Montefiore Hospital*, 732 F.2d 1572, 1577, 221 U.S.P.Q. 929, 933 (Fed. Cir. 1984). The mere fact that references can be combined or modified does not render the resultant combination obvious unless the prior art also suggests the desirability of the combination. *In re Mills*, 916 F.2d 680, 16 U.S.P.Q.2d. 1430 (Fed. Cir. 1990). Accordingly, to establish a *prima facie* case, the Examiner must not only show that the combination includes *all* of the claimed elements, but also a convincing line of reason as to why one of ordinary skill in the art would have found the claimed invention to have been obvious in light of the teachings of the references. *Ex parte Clapp*, 227 U.S.P.Q. 972 (B.P.A.I. 1985). The Examiner must provide objective evidence, rather than subjective belief and unknown authority, of the requisite motivation or suggestion to

combine or modify the cited references. *In re Lee*, 61 U.S.P.Q.2d. 1430 (Fed. Cir. 2002). Moreover, a statement that the proposed modification would have been “well within the ordinary skill of the art” based on individual knowledge of the claimed elements cannot be relied upon to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness without some *objective reason to combine* the teachings of the references. *Ex parte Levengood*, 28 U.S.P.Q.2d 1300 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1993); *In re Kotzab*, 217 F.3d 1365, 1371, 55 U.S.P.Q.2d. 1313, 1318 (Fed. Cir. 2000); *Al-Site Corp. v. VSI Int’l Inc.*, 174 F.3d 1308, 50 U.S.P.Q.2d. 1161 (Fed. Cir. 1999).

Second, when the Examiner relies on a theory of inherency, the extrinsic evidence must make clear that the missing descriptive matter is *necessarily* present in the thing described in the reference, and that it would be so recognized by persons of ordinary skill. *In re Robertson*, 169 F.3d 743, 49 U.S.P.Q.2d 1949 (Fed. Cir. 1999) (Emphasis Added). The mere fact that a certain thing *may* result from a given set of circumstances is not sufficient. *Id.* In relying upon the theory of inherency, the Examiner must provide a basis in fact and/or technical reasoning to reasonably support the determination that the allegedly inherent characteristic *necessarily* flows from the teachings of the applied prior art. *Ex parte Levy*, 17 U.S.P.Q.2d 1461, 1464 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1990). The Examiner, in presenting the inherency argument, bears the evidentiary burden and must adequately satisfy this burden. *See id.* Regarding functional limitations, the Examiner must evaluate and consider the functional limitation, just like any other limitation of the claim, for what it fairly conveys to a person of ordinary skill in the pertinent art in the context in which it is used. *See* M.P.E.P. § 2173.05(g); *In re Swinehart*, 169 U.S.P.Q.

226, 229 (C.C.P.A. 1971); *In re Schreiber*, 44 U.S.P.Q.2d 1429, 1432 (Fed. Cir. 1997). If the Examiner believes the functional limitation to be inherent in the cited reference, then the Examiner “must provide some evidence or scientific reasoning to establish the reasonableness of the examiner’s belief that the functional limitation is an inherent characteristic of the prior art.” *Ex parte Skinner*, 2 U.S.P.Q.2d 1788, 1789 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1986).

Claims 1-8

Turning now to the claims, independent claim 1, as amended, recites, among other things, a system comprising “an IOP,” “an embedded JTAG master that is controllable by the IOP,” and a “JTAG master [that] is configured to be accessed remotely through the remote server management controller to provide communication between a remote computer and the at least one integrated circuit via the JTAG interface.”

Detailed Rejection

In the Office Action, the Examiner specifically stated:

Li et al. teaches a managed server (column 2 line 13-14) and a management controller disposed in a managed server (FIG. 1), comprising an embedded JTAG master having a JTAG interface (FIG. 1 and FIG. 2); and at least one integrated circuit disposed in the managed server (FIG. 4 South Bridge 130 within 128) and connected for operative communication to the JTAG interface (via FIG. 4 118), and wherein the JTAG master is adapted to be accessed remotely through the remote server management controller (FIG. 4 106 or 120 or 110) to provide communication between a user and the at least one integrated circuit via the JTAG interface (example: FIG. 4 126 to 122 So 102, then access TEST LOG 20 of FIG. 1), and control of the JTAG interface is derived from the management controller (Column 4 lines 8-20). Li et al. fails to specifically cite an IOP (IO Processor) operatively connected to the

management controller, and a JTAG master interface. But one with ordinary skill in the art would know that the management controller of Li et al. would contain these two features, because the invention would not operate without them. And Li et al. has operatively combined the management controller with these two features (see FIG. 1, 2, and 4). And, in an analogous art, Falik et al. does cite these features. An IOP (FIG. 21 1844c) is connected to the JTAG Controller (FIG. 21 1841, and column 3 lines 17-35), teaching the combination of an IOP with JTAG in testing an integrated circuit (FIG. 21 1840). Falik et al., in column 1 lines 13-50 states an advantage of testing multiple ICs using only one debugger. One with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, motivated by Falik et al., would combine the teachings of one controller in testing more than one IC with the invention of Li et al. in order to increase the testing capabilities of Li et al.
Page 5, line 6 – page 6, line 4.

Deficiencies of Rejection

Neither Li nor Falik discloses an IOP (Input/Output Processor)

As discussed further below, Applicants respectfully stress that the combination of the Li reference and the Falik reference does not disclose all of the recited features of claims 1-8, and therefore, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the Examiner's rejections under 35 U.S. C. § 103(a).

The Examiner correctly noted on page 5 of the Office Action that "Li et al. fails to specifically cite an IOP (IO Processor) operatively connected to the management controller." Lines 15-16. In an attempt to cure this deficiency in the Li reference, the Examiner presented two theories. First, the Examiner suggested that "one with ordinary skill in the art would know that the management controller of Li et al. would contain ... [this feature] because the invention would not operate without [it]." Page 5, lines 17-18.

Second, the Examiner suggested that the Falik reference discloses an IOP and that “[o]ne with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, motivated by Falik et al., would combine the teachings of one controller in testing more than one IC with the invention of Li et al. in order to increase the testing capabilities of Li et al.” Page 6, lines 1-4.

With regard to the Examiner’s theory that the Li reference discloses an IOP because the invention would not operate without one, Applicants respectfully assert that the Examiner has provided insufficient basis in fact on which to base this claim of inherency. Applicants respectfully remind that Examiner that in presenting the inherency argument, the Examiner bears the evidentiary burden and must adequately satisfy this burden. *Ex parte Levy*, 17 U.S.P.Q.2d 1461, 1464 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1990) The Examiner must provide a basis in fact and/or technical reasoning to reasonably support the determination that an allegedly inherent characteristic *necessarily* flows from the teachings of the applied prior art. *Id.* As the Examiner has not provided any basis in fact, except for a conclusory statement, it is clear that the Examiner has not satisfied his burden with regard to this rejection. As such, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner provide a basis in fact to support his assertion in a subsequent non-final office action or withdrawn the rejection.

With regard to the Examiner’s use of the Falik reference, Applicants respectfully assert that the Falik reference does not remedy this deficiency, because the Falik reference clearly does not disclose an IOP, as recited in claim 1. In the Office Action, the Examiner pointed to element 1844c of Fig. 21 in the Falik reference as disclosing the

IOP. Applicants respectfully assert that the Examiner is incorrect with regard to this element. The Falik reference clearly states that element 1844c is an I/O *device* and not an I/O *processor*. See Col. 2, line 54. Further, there is nothing in the Falik reference that discloses or suggests that this I/O device 1844c is an I/O processor. In fact, the I/O device 1844 is only mentioned once in the Falik reference, and it is never described. See col. 2, line 54. It is merely acknowledged as being present. *Id.* Thus, it is clear that neither the Li reference nor the Falik reference discloses an IOP as recited in claims 1-8.

Further, the Falik reference provides no indication that the I/O device 1844c even interacts with the debugger 1841, which the Examiner erroneously referred to as “the JTAG controller.” See Falik, col. 2, lines 5-58 and Office Action, page 5, lines 21-22. As such, even if the Falik reference did disclose an IOP instead of an I/O device, that IOP could not be part of “an embedded JTAG master that is controllable by the IOP,” as recited in claims 1 because the Falik reference does not disclose any communication between the debugger 1841 and the I/O device 1844c.

Because neither the Li reference nor the Falik reference discloses an IOP as recited in claims 1, Applicants respectfully assert that neither reference discloses “an embedded JTAG master that is controllable by the IOP,” as recited in claims 1. For this reason alone, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 103(a) rejection against claim 1 as well as those claims that depend therefrom.

Neither reference discloses communication between a remote computer and at least one integrated circuit via the JTAG interface

Neither the Li reference nor the Falik reference discloses a JTAG master “configured to be accessed remotely through the remote server management controller to provide communication between a remote computer and the at least one integrated circuit via the JTAG interface,” as recited in claim 1, as amended.

The Li reference is directed towards “a system and method for testing component IC chips using JTAG test standards which does not require the use of separate testing equipment.” Col. 1, lines 62-64. To this end, the Li reference discloses a “system [that] includes a management controller that has an embedded JTAG test routine operable to test one or more component IC chips associated with the management controller.” Abstract, lines 2-5. It is clear from the Ethernet controller 122 and remote systems 126 that are shown in Fig. 4 of the Li reference, that the apparatus disclosed in the Li reference was designed to function in a networked environment. However, this functionality is limited. Specifically, the Li reference states that:

Management controller 102 is further operable to selectively *transfer a test result or a log of previous test results* to remote systems 126 through modem 104 and phone line 106 or Ethernet controller 122 and internet 124. Alternatively, remote systems 126 may be allowed selective access to management controller 102 through phone line 106, internet 124, Ethernet 120, or I²C controller 108 *to access a test result or a log of previous test results*. Once accessed, the test results may be analyzed to identify malfunctioning or defective component IC chips remotely.

Col. 5, lines 7-16 (emphasis added)

As the section of the Li reference cited above makes clear, the network connections disclosed in the Li reference are used merely for retrieving test results from the management controller 102. As such, it cannot disclose a JTAG master “configured to be accessed remotely through the remote server management controller to provide communication between a remote computer and the at least one integrated circuit via the JTAG interface,” as recited in claim 1, because the retrieving of test results in the Li reference is communication between the management controller and a remote system via the Ethernet controller alone and *not* communication between a remote computer and at least one integrated circuit via the JTAG interface, as recited in claim 1. Further, the communication disclosed in the Li reference is between a remote system and the management controller 102 (*see* col. 5, lines 7-16), whereas, the communication recited in claim 1 is between the “remote computer and the at least one integrated circuit.”

The Falik reference does not cure this deficiency in the Li reference. The Falik reference discloses an improved debugger for use in a multiprocessor system. *See* col. 1, lines 34-37. As such, it does not disclose a “JTAG master [that] is configured to be accessed remotely through the remote server management controller to provide communication between a remote computer and the at least one integrated circuit via the JTAG interface,” because the Falik reference does not disclose a remote computer, much less communication between the “remote computer and the at least one integrated circuit,” as recited in claim 1.

For these further reasons, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the 103(a) rejections against claim 1 and the claims that depend therefrom.

Claims 9-15

Independent claim 9, as amended, recites, among other things, a managed server comprising a remote server management controller that comprises: “an IOP,” “an embedded JTAG master that is controllable by the IOP,” and a “JTAG master [that] is configured to be accessed remotely through the remote server management controller to provide communication between a remote computer and the at least one integrated circuit via the JTAG interface.”

Detailed Rejection

In the Office Action, the Examiner specifically stated:

Li et al. teaches a managed server (column 2 line 13-14) and a management controller disposed in a managed server (FIG. 1), comprising an embedded JTAG master having a JTAG interface (FIG. 1 and FIG. 2); and at least one integrated circuit disposed in the managed server (FIG. 4 South Bridge 130 within 128) and connected for operative communication to the JTAG interface (via FIG. 4 118), and wherein the JTAG master is adapted to be accessed remotely through the remote server management controller (FIG. 4 106 or 120 or 110) to provide communication between a user and the at least one integrated circuit via the JTAG interface (example: FIG. 4 126 to 122 50 102, then access TEST LOG 20 of FIG. 1), and control of the JTAG interface is derived from the management controller (Column 4 lines 8-20). Li et al. fails to specifically cite an IOP (IO Processor) operatively connected to the management controller, and a JTAG master interface. But one with ordinary skill in the art would know that the management controller of Li et al. would contain these two features, because the invention would not operate without them. And Li et al. has operatively combined the

management controller with these two features (see FIG. 1, 2, and 4). And, in an analogous art, Falik et al. does cite these features. An IOP (FIG. 21 1844c) is connected to the JTAG Controller (FIG. 21 1841, and column 3 lines 17-35), teaching the combination of an IOP with JTAG in testing an integrated circuit (FIG. 21 1840). Falik et al., in column 1 lines 13-50 states an advantage of testing multiple ICs using only one debugger. One with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, motivated by Falik et al., would combine the teachings of one controller in testing more than one IC with the invention of Li et al. in order to increase the testing capabilities of Li et al.
Page 5, line 6 – page 6, line 4.

Deficiencies of Rejection

For reasons very similar to those discussed above in regard to independent claim 1, it is clear that neither the Li reference nor the Falik reference discloses “an IOP,” or “an embedded JTAG master that is controllable by the IOP,” as recited in the claim 9. Because the Examiner admitted in the Office Action that the Li reference “fails to specifically cite an IOP (IO Processor) operatively connected to the management controller,” and the Examiner has not provided a basis in fact on which to base a claim of inherency, it is clear that the Li reference cannot be relied upon to disclose an IOP, as recited in claim 9. *See* Page 5, lines 15-19. As for the Falik reference, as described above, it clearly discloses an I/O *device* and not an I/O *processor*. *See* Col 2, line 54. Because the Falik reference provides no description of its I/O device, it also cannot disclose an IOP, as recited in claim 9. *Id.* For these reasons alone, it is clear that neither the Li reference nor the Falik reference discloses the subject matter recited in independent claim 9.

In addition, neither the Li reference nor the Falik reference discloses a “JTAG master [that] is configured to be accessed remotely through the remote server management controller to provide communication between a remote computer and the at least one integrated circuit via the JTAG interface,” as recited in claim 9. As described above, the Li reference cannot disclose this feature because the network connection disclosed in the Li reference is used merely for retrieving test results from the management controller 102. *See* col. 5, lines 7-16. Further, as also stated above, the Falik reference does not disclose a remote computer, much less communication between the “remote computer and the at least one integrated circuit,” as recited in claim 9. For these reasons, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the 103(a) rejections against claim 9 and its dependent claims.

Claims 16-20

Independent claim 16, as amended, recites, among other things, a method of communicating with an integrated circuit comprising “receiving data at the IOP of the remote server management controller; transmitting the data from the IOP to the JTAG master; and transmitting the data from the JTAG master to the integrated circuit via the JTAG interface.”

Detailed Rejection

In the Office Action, the Examiner specifically stated:

Li et al. teaches a method of communication with an integrated circuit in a managed server (column 2 line 13-14), the managed server having a remote server management controller in operative communication therewith (FIG. 1), the JTAG master having a JTAG

interface connected for operative communication to the integrated circuit (FIG. 2), the method comprising the acts of: receiving data at the IOP of the remote server management controller (column 6 lines 32-33); transmitting the data from the IOP to the JTAG master (column 2 lines 1-12); transmitting the data from the JTAG master to the integrated circuit via the JTAG interface (column 3 lines 48-56). Li et al. fails to specifically cite an IOP (IO Processor) operatively connected to the management controller, and a JTAG master interface. But one with ordinary skill in the art would know that the management controller of Li et al. would contain these two features, because the invention would not operate without them. And Li et al. has operatively combined the management controller with these two features (see FIG. 1, 2, and 4). And, in an analogous art, Falik et al. does cite these features. An IOP (FIG. 21 1844c) is connected to the JTAG Controller (FIG. 21 1841, and column 3 lines 17-35), teaching the combination of an IOP with JTAG in testing an integrated circuit (FIG. 21 1840). And in view of the motivation previously stated, the claim is rejected.
Page 7, lines 5 – 21.

Deficiencies of Rejection

For reasons very similar to those discussed above in regard to independent claim 1 and independent claim 9, it is clear that neither the Li reference nor the Falik reference discloses “receiving data at the IOP...[and] transmitting the data from the IOP to the JTAG master,” as recited in claim 16. As stated above, the Examiner admitted in the Office Action that the Li reference “fails to specifically cite an IOP (IO Processor) operatively connected to the management controller,” and the Examiner has provided no basis in fact on which to base the Examiner’s claim of inherency. *See* Page 5, lines 15-19. Also, as described above, the Falik reference clearly discloses an *I/O device* and not an *I/O processor*. *See* Col 2, line 54. Because the Falik reference provides no description of its *I/O device*, it also cannot disclose an IOP, as recited in claim 16. *Id.* As

such, it is clear that the neither the Li reference nor the Falik reference discloses “receiving data at the IOP...[and] transmitting the data from the IOP to the JTAG master,” as recited in claim 16. For this reason, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 103(a) rejection and allowance of claims 16-20.

Claims 2, 3, and 10

In the Official Action, the Examiner rejected claims 2, 3, and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable by Li et al. in view of Falik et al. and in further view of Lee et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,065, 078, hereafter referred to as Lee) The Examiner’s rejections are too lengthy to be reproduced efficiently herein. Nonetheless, Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner’s rejections.

Deficiencies of Rejection

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 2, 3, and 10 are allowable based on their dependencies on claims 1 and 9 because the Lee reference does not cure the deficiencies in either the Li or Falik references. For this reason, claims 2, 3, and 10 are allowable for the reasons outlined above. Thus, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 103(a) rejections against claims 2, 3, and 10.


For the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the Examiner’s rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) and allowance of all pending claims.

Conclusion

The Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims should be in condition for allowance. However, if the Examiner believes certain amendments are necessary to clarify the present claims or if the Examiner wishes to resolve any other issues by way of a telephone conference, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 13, 2004



Michael G. Fletcher
Reg. No. 32,777
(281) 970-4545

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, Colorado 80527-2400